



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,355	08/26/2003	Florence Eschbach	10559-865001 / Intel P173	4179
20985 7590 12/27/2006 FISH & RICHARDSON, PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			EXAMINER HU, HENRY S	
			ART UNIT 1713	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/27/2006	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/649,355

Applicant(s)

ESCHBACH ET AL.

Examiner

Henry S. Hu

Art Unit

1713

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-17 and 33-38.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

H 107

12-20-2006



DAVID W. WU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The Amendment after final has been thoroughly studied by this examiner. Only dependent Claim 12 was amended so as to remove the "typographical" error on using "flexible" language on recticle. However, it still does not place the application for allowance after final action because:

Since current parent Claim 1 has not further amended in view of scope limitation, all pending Claims 1-17 and 33-38 are still fundamentally covered by those arguments as discussed in the final office action. However, the examiner has recognized at least two key points from pages 9-11 of Remarks.

First, Applicants point out on page 9 that "Ikeda only uses one pellicle-to-one frame ratio throughout his US 6,300,019 B1". The Examiner understands that Applicants' Figures 2B, 4B and 5B are different from Ikeda's Figure 5B. Attention is directed to two facts that either two pellicle membranes or one single pellicle membrane is mounted in between two frames by Ikeda, while Ikeda is indeed using two frames skeleton for pellicle or pellicles (column 4, line 49-51). Therefore, the current issue is that Ikeda's in-between pellicle or pellicles is not located "exactly at the middle of" such a two-frame structure. In response to that, Applicants are reminded that open language "comprising" is used in the process of parent Claim 1, which only requires clamping the pellicle to be between two frames. Such a wording "between" may be read as broad as possible, it does NOT require to be exactly between or exactly in the middle or center of two frames according to MPEP rule.

Second, Applicants argue on page 10 that showing the "criticality" of why clamping may be not needed since none of the cited references in combination or alone are understood to describe or suggest attaching pellicle to the two frame skeleton can be clamped instead of "gluing". The Examiner understands that clamping may be at least somewhat different from gluing. For instance, the pellicle can be easily replaced or readjusted. However, the function of fixing or tightening the pellicle onto the two frames structure as known in the art may be the same or similar. Therefore, Applicants still need to show the "criticality" why the clamping method for mounting such a pellicle is needed to show "unobviousness" so as to totally overcome 103 rejection.

In summary, a new consideration and search is thereby required to be sure of above two questions being thoroughly answered.

H.12  
12-20-2006